

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| 10/004,157 | 10/31/2001 | Beth T. Logan | 200301980-2 | 8521 |
| 7590 07/27/2005 | | | EXAMINER | |
| IP ADMINISTRATION, LEGAL DEPARTMENT, M/S 35, HEWLETT - PACKARD COMPANY, | | | MAHMOUDI, HASSAN | |
| P. O. BOX 272 | • | | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER | |
| FORT COLLIN | NS,, CO 80527-2400 | | 2165 | |

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | V | <u> </u> | TW | | | |
|---|--|---|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | : | | | |
| Advisory Action | 10/004,157 | LOGAN ET AL. | | | | |
| Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Examiner | Art Unit | : | | | |
| | Tony Mahmoudi | 2165 | : | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | J | correspondence addre | SS | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 07 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of | | | | | | |
| this application, applicant must timely file one of the folloplaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a N (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in composition time periods: | owing replies: (1) an amendment, a lotice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in pliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The rep | affidavit, or other evidend compliance with 37 CF | ce, which R 41.31; or | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing | | C. L. L. R Lt | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the | | | s later. In no | | | |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) |). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE F | | NITHIN TWO | | | |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date or been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension of CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened st above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | n which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a and the corresponding amount of the fee. tatutory period for reply originally set in the | The appropriate extension to final Office action; or (2) as | fee under 37 s set forth in (b) | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date | | | | | | |
| of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | |
| Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must | be filed within the time period set for | orth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). | • | | | |
| AMENDMENTS 2. The represent amondment (a) filled of the a final rejection | | | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below.) | onsideration and/or search (see NC ow); | TE below); | | | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or | ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | | ne issues for | | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | ejected claims. | | | | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). | | | | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s | - | omphant Amendment (i | 102-02-7). | | | |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a | | timely filed amendmer | nt canceling | | | |
| the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proof The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | vill be entered and an ex | planation of | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | • | : | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: | | | · | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | : | | | |
| 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b | | | | | | |
| because applicant failed to provide a showing of good at and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | nd sufficient reasons why the affida | ivit or other evidence is | necessary | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary. | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S | eal and/or appellant fails See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1) | to provide a | | | |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation | on of the status of the claims after | entry is below or attache | ∍d. | | | |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: | | | | | | |
| See Continuation Sheet. | | | e pecause: | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) | . (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper | No(s) | | | | |
| 13. Other: | | | | | | |
| | | | : | | | |
| | • | | . 🔻 | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The applicant's arguments presented in the After Final response, filed on 07-July-2005 have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive and the claim limitations of the "Finally Rejected" claims are still met by the previously cited references.

In response to the applicant's arguments that "to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), (1) there must be some suggestion and motivation to combine reference teachings", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive because the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the examiner is establishing motivation in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Yourlo by the teaching of Sanderson, and relying on Hoory et al for the motivation of combining Yourlo as modified, to includes Hamming window on each frame and to include reapplying a pre-emphasis on each frame.

In response to the applicant's arguments that the references either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest the referenced limitations of various claims, the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive, because:

"forming a spectral signature based on spectral features from the corresponding audio file" is taught by Yourlo (column 5, lines 64-67);
"forming a rhythmic beat representation from the corresponding audio file" is also taught by Yourlo (column 1, lines 43-47 and column 5, lines 37-42); "summing, including respective weighting results" is taught by Yourlo (column 11, lines 10-26).

JEFFREY GATFUN

SUPERVISORY NATENT EXAMINER

ECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100